

O'Connor, P. (2019) 'An autoethnographic account of a pragmatic inclusionary strategy and tactics as a form of feminist activism', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, DOI: 10.1108/edi-12-2018-0227.

Abstract

Purpose-The purpose of this article is to explore the enactment of a pragmatic inclusionary strategy and related tactics as a form of feminist activism in one university.

Design/methodology/approach- The article uses analytic autoethnography

Findings: It shows how it is possible for a feminist activist to create limited change in what is typically seen as an intractable indicator of gender equality i.e. gender parity at full professorial level.

Research limitations/implications: Analytic autoethnography as a method has considerable methodological limitations although it also offers insights into insider strategies and tactics.

Practical/Social implications: The identification of such a strategy and tactics may be useful to activists, decision-makers and policy makers with an interest in tackling any source of inequality.

Originality/value- Five tactics, reflecting a pragmatic inclusionary strategy are identified i.e. provocative misbehaviour; individualised managing management; perverse alignments; resisting silencing and gaining legitimacy; activating latent social movement ties to change national policy.

Keywords- feminist activism; pragmatic inclusionary strategy; tactics; neoliberal; higher education; feminist institutionalism; autoethnography, Ireland

Paper type: Research paper

Introduction

Universities have historically been hierarchically male dominated institutions with men constituting the majority of those in senior academic and management positions in a masculinised structure and culture, which reinforces women's subordinate position and lack of 'recognition' (Fraser, 2008). Witz (2013) identified exclusionary strategies which denied women's access to the professions in the 19th and 20th century. She also described inclusionary strategies: 'the upwards, countervailing exercise of power by a social group which is hit by exclusionary strategies, but which in its turn, seeks inclusion within the structure of positions from which its members are collectively debarred' (Witz, 2013: 48). She identified credentialist and legalistic tactics used in pursuit of that strategy. More subtle exclusionary strategies persist in male dominated areas in higher education (HE) while female dominated areas, which are likely to have greater gender equality in terms of leadership, are devalued (England, 2010). This article is concerned with the identification of a pragmatic inclusionary strategy and tactics to increase gender parity in the male dominated academic professoriate.

In Ireland, women constitute the majority of those at the lowest level of the academic staff hierarchy, but only a minority of those at full professorial level (HEA, 2018a; EC, 2019). Male dominance inhibits research innovation (EU, 2012), economic growth (OECD, 2012) and the utilization of talent, however defined. It is a social justice issue which limits the availability of role models and ultimately constitutes symbolic violence (Bourdieu 2001).

Creating change in organisations is difficult (By, 2005). Relatively little is known 'about the gendered nature of organisational change and intervention processes' (Parsons and Priola, 2013:580). The purportedly gender neutral but in practice masculinised

structure and culture of HE, with its purportedly gender neutral neoliberal ideologies of excellence and individual choice, pose particular challenges for internal change agents such as feminist activists. Achieving gender parity at full professorial level is frequently seen as an intractable issue: challenging as it does the equation between power and masculinity. Using an autoethnographic approach, this article explores the pragmatic inclusionary strategy and tactics adopted to improve gender parity at professorial level in one neoliberal HE context, namely, the University of Limerick (UL) in Ireland. In UL the proportion of women at (full) professorial level increased from zero in 1997 to 34 per cent in 2012, subsequently remaining at 31 per cent: considerably higher than the average (24 per cent) for universities in Ireland and the EU (HEA, 2018a; EC, 2019).

Theoretical framework

The theoretical perspective is that of Feminist Institutionalism (FI) (Mackay et al, 2010, Mackay, 2011). Building on the work of Acker (1990, 2006) on gendered organisations and Connell (1987, 2002) on gender regimes, FI is concerned with ‘the gendered character of institutions and the gendering effects of institutions’ including ‘mechanisms of continuity, and the promise and limits of gendered change’ (Mackay 2011: 181). It sees gender operating at the structural and cultural level and at the formal and informal level. Gender is seen as a ‘constitutive element of social relations based upon perceived (socially constructed and culturally variable) differences between women and men, and as a primary way of signifying (and naturalising) relations of power and hierarchy’ (Mackay et al., 2010:580). It suggests that a devaluation of women is implicit in the very construction of gender. Gendered structures, procedures, practices, processes, criteria and culture normalise and hence implicitly legitimate that devaluation.

Taking Walby's (2011) definition of feminism as the contestation of established institutions and practices of power, feminism can be identified at the micro level. Assuming that gender is embedded in everyday life (West and Zimmerman, 1987) the dominant gendered social order in male dominated organizations can be challenged and the association between men and power positions broken.

In the last two-or-three decades universities have been deeply affected by neoliberal principles, ideas and practices (Walby, 2009, 2011). Collegial governance structures are being replaced by more top-down ones, where centralised power is the norm (Carvalho and Santiago, 2010). Neoliberalism involves a strong focus on global rankings and metrics, particularly research metrics. The effects of these changes on gender equality in HE is contested (Acker and Wager, 2019; Deem, 1998; Davis and Thomas, 2002; O'Connor, 2014a). FI has tended not to focus on neoliberalism, although Grace (2011:111) noted that neoliberalism has tended to 'degender and depoliticize women's experiences by framing them as workers, individuals and family members,' and so has arguably contributed to perpetuating the myth of gender neutrality in HE.

Models of change in HE have mainly focused on the impact of external factors, such as neoliberalism, and specific gender interventions (such as Athena SWAN in the UK (Barnard, 2017), ADVANCE in the US (Laursen and De Welde, 2019). However, it has also been recognised that particular organisational characteristics are important (O'Connor, 2017) and that change can be driven by feminist activists internally (Parsons and Priola, 2013, Bendl and Schmidt, 2012). FI sees change as 'driven by gendered processes from within and without', suggesting that: 'changes to the structuring of gender relations (at micro-level or broader societal shifts) are important potential sources of broader institutional change' (Mackay et al, 2010: 584, 582). FI is aware of the dangers of 'overly structural accounts that underplay the role of women as agents who strategize

in response to changing political opportunity structures' (Krook and Mackay, 2011: 190). They recognise the ways in which attempts at institutional change are frustrated (Kenney, 1996). Some work has focused on gender equity entrepreneurs, strategic actors and gate openers as sources of political and policy change (Chappell, 2006, 2002, Annesley, 2010, Mackay and Murtagh, 2019). However, FI, which has its roots in politics, has been mainly concerned with feminist agency around specific political policies (Freidenvall and Krook, 2011). With a small number of exceptions (such as Verge et al., 2018 on mainstreaming gender into the curriculum) it has been little used in work on HE, with even less attention paid to change agents in that context.

De Certeau (1984: xix-xx) defines strategies as 'the calculus of force-relationships' which conceal 'their connection with the power that sustains them from within the stronghold of its own 'proper' place or institution'. Implicit in that definition is the idea that strategies are the preserve of the powerful, and that, although they appear objective, their underlying purpose is the maintenance of the status quo. Strategies create the framework within which others must move. De Certeau (1984: xix) juxtaposes strategies with tactics, seeing the latter as opportunistic adaptations to the world created by the powerful: 'a tactic insinuates itself into the other's place.....it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized 'on the wing.'"' In contexts where strategies are never total or never totally implemented, consistent or effective, those without power must be alert to gaps, tensions, inconsistencies and turn them into opportunities for their own advantage. Implicit in De Certeau (1984)'s work is the idea that power will not shift in response to tactics. This contrasts with Correll (2017:745) who saw 'small wins' in a gender equality context as 'the path to achieve our larger goal, which is the transformation of our organisations.' In facilitating such 'small wins' she stressed the importance of naming gender; identifying the location of bias and getting management buy in.

Meyerson and Scully (1995: 586) put forward the concept of ‘tempered radicals’- ‘individuals who identify with and are committed to their organizations, and are also committed to a cause, community or ideology that is fundamentally different from, and possibly at odds with, the dominant culture of their organization’. They are inside/outside- people who are ambitious for the organisation but also want it to change. They are seen as potentially key agents in promoting organisational change at the level of gender equality

In an FI perspective, feminists located in male dominated, masculinist organisations are by definition not in a powerful position. In this situation strategy is very close to tactics: ‘The weaker the forces at the disposition of the strategist.... The more the strategy is transformed into tactics’ (De Certeau, 1984: 36-37). A pragmatic inclusionary strategy is one which is characterised by a focus on available opportunities and differs from tactics only in terms of envisioning a long-term goal of shared power. Thus, from an FI perspective, in a context where gendered power is ubiquitous, feminist agency may be reflected in tactics, which may or may not shift power, but which in any event create space and maintain hope. At least potentially, an inclusionary strategy and tactic can be undertaken by individuals, such as ‘tempered radicals’, on behalf of a group in academia and can be defined as feminist activism (Bendl and Schmidt, 2012; Bendl et al, 2014).

These concepts underpin the focus in this article on a pragmatic inclusionary strategy aimed at achieving categorical parity in the predominantly male professoriate i.e. involving an ‘upwards countervailing exercise of power’ (Witz, 2002:48).

National Context

Ireland is a small country (4.8 million) with a strong tradition of clientelism. No woman has ever headed an Irish public university, although a minority have headed/head

up public institutes of technology. Public universities operate under the Universities Act (1997) with neoliberal thinking reflected in identifying a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) role for the president. The Act requires the promotion of gender balance among staff (1997: 12k), the preparation and implementation of a university policy on gender equality and the establishment of related structures. There has been little attempt at effective implementation (a common Irish pattern: OECD, 2012). The HEA has an advisory, review and monitoring role relating to the promotion of gender balance among university staff. Atlantic Philanthropies (AP) a major non-statutory funder of Irish HE identified gender inequality as a social justice issue in the 1990s.

A successful gender equality case taken against NUI Galway (Equality Tribunal, 2014) and pressure from EU funded projects culminated in the introduction of the Athena SWAN awards (2015); in the Expert Group report (HEA, 2016) and the Taskforce Report (HEA, 2018b). The purpose of the Expert Group Report (2016) was ‘to be disruptive of the status quo and to force the pace of change’ (Quinlivan 2017:72). It included a professorial quota of 40 per cent by 2024 and recommended that staff be allowed to apply for research funding only if their institution had achieved an Athena SWAN award. The latter was accepted by the main research funding bodies in 2016. The Task Force report (HEA, 2018:74) re-iterated its recommendations as regards the linking of the state grant to the gender profile of those in senior positions. Fifteen professorial positions per annum for a three-year period in areas where women were under-represented was subsequently announced (2019). Most of the national facilitating factors existed after 2015, at a time when when the proportion of women at full professorial level in UL declined slightly.

Methodology

The methodology involves analytic autoethnography (Anderson, 2006). At the heart of all autoethnography lies a recognition that it is ‘a form of self-narrative that places the self within the social context’ (Styhre and Tienari, 2013:197). Evocative autoethnography involves a personal account of a life (Hearn, 2014) or a response to a specific situation (Yassour-Borochowitz, 2012): ‘the mode of storytelling is akin to the novel or biography... the narrative text refuses to abstract and explain’ (Ellis and Bochner, 2000:744). Anderson (2006: 378) sees analytic ethnography as having five key characteristics: ‘complete member researcher status’; ‘analytic reflexivity’, ‘narrative visibility of the researcher’s self’, ‘dialogue with informants beyond the self’ and ‘commitment to theoretical analysis’. It has similarities with Liu and Pechenkina’s (2016: 186) reflective autoethnography in its concern with ‘a theoretical understanding of social processes’ (Anderson, 2006:387). As in that work (Liu and Pechenkina, 2016:191) ‘lived experiences’, are examined in ‘hindsight’, frequently focusing on ““epiphanies”, which are self-claimed phenomena... that created long-lasting effects and memories as a result of an experienced “intense” situation’.

In all forms of autoethnography, there are considerable challenges as regards reflexivity. Styhre and Tienari (2013: 206) suggest that self-reflexivity is what is produced ‘in those moments when we are forced to encounter the other’s view of ourselves’. Thus, it remains closer to the social sciences since its purpose is to contribute to an understanding of social processes. However, it has clear limitations: it is always partial, is prone to bias and to the potentially distorting effects of memory, inadequate reflexivity and the difficulties of establishing causality. Nevertheless, it can provide insights that would be unobtainable in any other way. It can also be seen as an activist

reaction to the status quo: potentially ‘an act of transformational resistance’ (Liu and Pechenkina, 2016: 191):

As a sociologist, feminist, director of women’s studies in UL (1992-97), member of the university equal opportunity committee (1996-2008), (full) professor (1997-2016), member of governing authority (2004-2007) and faculty dean (2000-2010), I had access to various kinds of data related to gender equality. From 1994 onwards I was beginning to advocate for gender equality in UL, internally and externally. In that context, I often needed to marshal data and arguments quickly. I began to keep emails, letters, memos and meeting minutes from the chair of equal opportunity committee, Human Resources data requested by and supplied to me, funding applications involving gender equality, internal reports, briefing documents, presentations to governing authority, to management committee, deans council and executive committee, conference presentations, publications and other documents related to gender equality. In accumulating this data, the key criterion was whether it could be useful in making an argument, reminding others of commitments given, or was any way relevant to moving the gender equality agenda forward. This article is based on that data while not breaching the confidentiality of private correspondence. In narrating my experience as a change agent in various presentations over the years, I frequently found myself explaining the basis for my actions as pragmatic, reflecting a desire to take action in a constrained situation where shared values did not exist. I also frequently focused on critical moments or ‘epiphanies’. This was an unconscious narrative strategy: one that I had equally unconsciously used in an earlier study of young people (O’Connor, 2008).

Positioning, Opportunities and Challenges

Up to the early 1990s, although by then working in my fifth higher educational and research institution in Ireland and the UK, I had chosen to ignore organisational power, both personally and in my research agenda as a sociologist. I had survived for the most part by (quite unconsciously) creating sub-worlds within organisations and ignoring the organisational devaluation of them. I assumed that a meritocracy existed. That assumption had begun to be challenged in the late 1980s. Coming to UL and being appointed course director of women's studies (1992-97) was transformative. I was forced to confront the reality of gender-based discrimination, misogyny and inequality. I found this very challenging since I had up to that point deliberately cultivated a naïve optimism about people and ignored hierarchy- 'treating the prince and pauper just the same'. I found it easy to interact with people- men and women alike. Now my fundamental assumptions and perspectives were challenged. My positioning became that of a feminist activist. The tensions implicit in that positioning have been recognised (Sang et al, 2012). Initially focused on survival: my own and that of women's studies; then fuelled by righteous anger, I began to challenge gender inequality in what I saw as the male dominated, masculinist context of UL.

Moving (very surprisingly- to myself and others) from lecturer to academic professor in 1997 and to faculty dean in 2000 (the first woman in both these positions in UL) brought opportunities as well as difficulties. The opportunities included the possibility of redefining the enactment of power by stressing its service element; interrupting male line management reproduction by encouraging those at all levels to undertake management responsibilities for a limited period of time. It made it possible to raise the issue of gender inequality at management level; to chair faculty appointment and promotion boards (apart from those at professorial level, which were chaired by the

President) and to initiate specific gendered departmental measures (such as annual gender auditing of extern examiners). Despite my commitment to challenging the differential evaluation of male and female candidates, I failed to recognise that the taken-for-granted practice of reviewing and adjusting the marking schema on the day of interview (when all the board members first met) subverted attempts to eliminate micro-political practices (O'Connor et al., 2017).

From 2008 onwards, faculty deans were members of executive committee. There were difficulties there arising from structurally created internal inequalities e.g. vice presidents evaluated faulty recruitment plans but deans had no power to reciprocate. There were other difficulties including resistance by many academics at all levels to gender equality and many women's withdrawal from power: perceiving me as having 'gone over to the other side' (Harford, 2018). In 2012 having completed my third full period as dean I returned to my home department until my official retirement in 2016.

The most personally exhausting position was course director in women's studies because of the (to me extraordinary) level of hostility and misogyny it evoked among men. The last few months of my deanship were also hard with power leaking away as I struggled to plan my future. Overall however, I enjoyed making things happen and being part of a diverse team at faculty level (in terms of gender, level and nationality) characterised by laughter and hard work. Strong positive ties with each of the presidents facilitated my survival: but there were limits to that. Feedback from the then president on my application for the position of vice president academic in the mid-noughties indicated that my commitment to feminist principles rather than to organisational politics had militated against my appointment. I was re-appointed as faculty dean: acceptable in coming up to the elbows of the most powerful men, but not to their shoulders (MIT, 1999:1).

Nature of the Organisation: obstacles and opportunities

The University of Limerick (UL) is a regional public university, with over 13,000 students and 1,300 academic and non-academic staff. One of seven public universities it operates under the Universities Act (1997), receiving funding from the state through the HEA. It was founded as a National Institute for HE by Ed Walsh to meet the needs of local industry, with a strong focus on applied and interdisciplinary areas, particularly in engineering and technology (Walsh and Fagan, 2011). It was awarded university status in 1989. Its founder remained its president for 28 years and power even in the 1990s, was concentrated in him, although collegial structures and processes existed. The staffing model in the 1980s and 1990s was a business model, at a time when neoliberalism was not part of the Irish HE system. The 1998- 2007 period was one of extraordinary internal instability in UL (Thorn, 2017), with four Presidents and five Directors of Human Resources. A more stable organisational period coincided with the national economic recession (2008-2014). UNITE is the only union recognised in UL. Its strength internally has varied over time, although it has appeared to have little interest in gender equality.

As a new university there was an opportunity to shape the gender profile of the professoriate. The number of (full) professors in UL increased by 2.7 (1993-2012: 18 to 50) as compared with an increase of 1.6 (317 to 512) across the total university system. Winning a state organised competition between HEs for a community based medical school added nine per cent to the proportion of women at professoriate level. In the 1990s and early 2000s there was a great deal of activity in women's studies in UL involving seminars, conferences, publishing and teaching activities facilitated by substantial five-year funding by Atlantic Philanthropies (AP). In the 2000s, the focus shifted to mainstreaming gender in the curriculum, particularly in Sociology, English and History. Success in accessing European funding facilitated the co-funding of a university creche

in the 1990s (despite management opposition). In a funding application to AP (Jordan and Richardson 2001) targets at senior lecturer level were identified (and exceeded by 2007). In 2015, UL was one of the first HEIs to be awarded a bronze Athena SWAN award. In 2012 it had – at 34 per cent- the highest proportion of women at (full) professorial level (now 31 per cent).

Tactics: Vignettes and Themes

As De Certeau (1984) recognised, tactics are shaped in specific situations and in response to opportunities. Those outlined below varied in the degree to which they were consciously planned. Although they occurred between 1992-2016, they were labelled much more recently: this labelling being done abductively as an analytical device. These tactics necessitated ‘border work’: defined by Newman (2013: 216) as ‘self-work to manage tensions and dilemmas’ arising from being ‘inside-outside’, (...) ‘shouting from the sidelines’ (...) being ‘marginal’, being ‘in and against’’: reflecting a state of ambiguity arising from being part of and yet separate from the dominant order. At times I was afraid, often angry. I was frequently exhausted. I avoided burn-out by availing of a research day- normally on a Friday- so that I had a chance to recover over the week-end. I kept a list of what I considered my successes on the back of my office door. I found that position (as a professor and later dean) protected me somewhat from male devaluation, although it also isolated me from female solidarity.

Tactic 1: Provocative misbehaviour

Gender inequality in UL emerged as an important issue for the women’s studies community in the early 1990s. From then onwards I initially requested and then

monitored gender staffing data in UL and used it in various fora (e.g. in presentations to permanent and ad hoc committees concerned with promotion, equality, management or governance). At that time women only constituted 15 per cent of all faculty in UL (20 per cent nationally: O'Connor, 2014b). Staffing in women's studies was particularly limited, and mostly part-time and temporary. I had responsibility for the Graduate Diploma/MA in Women's Studies. Students increasingly chose a gender related topic for their undergraduate dissertation. A long queue of students formed outside the door of my small office in a side corridor: the students having been told to 'talk to me'. There was no question of me becoming their co-supervisor: their (male) supervisors simply wanted me to help them. When I tackled the men involved, they protested that they were doing me a favour by recognising my area of expertise. I began to feel overwhelmed by this extra, invisible work. As a woman, particularly one in women's studies I was expected to be the 'great breast'. The underlying problem was the imbalance between the gender profile of staff and students (very few men in the faculty were interested in gender equality). I put a notice on my door drawing attention to these facts and asking for them to be brought to the attention of the dean of the faculty and the head of the student's union. That seemed to me to be very reasonable. Faculty diverting from the main corridor to look at the notice suggested a different interpretation. I was summoned to a meeting with the then dean. He saw the notice as implying that he was not concerned with gender equality and asked me to remove it. He did not propose solving what I saw as the underlying problem and so I refused to do so although I did agree to modify it.

In 1997 I became the first woman appointed at full professorial level in the university (and the first woman professor of sociology in Ireland). I had the opportunity to apply for this post since the public advertisement did not specify that only applicants at or above senior lecturer level could apply (I was still at lecturer level). I had an

impressive CV, with achievements in teaching, research and service, and a very high profile as course director in women's studies. When I was offered the post, I (unexpectedly) felt dreadful. I felt that the shoes of the professor were too big for me; that there were better women than I who should have got the post, although none of them had applied. (I had no such feelings when I was appointed dean: the shoes of the dean seemed to me to be very small). I felt sad and guilty that my mother had neither lived to see my success nor had these opportunities herself. She had (unusually for the 1930s) gone to university, but by the time she graduated the Marriage Bar (a ban on married women continuing in employment after marriage: O'Connor, 1998) was in existence. In an attempt to pay past debts and to work towards a better future for women, I initiated annual personally funded awards (1997-2010), exclusively for high achieving women students based on their state examination results. Each year I made a speech, highlighting UL's gender profile at professorial level, and my hope that those receiving the bursaries would continue this struggle. Inviting senior management (usually one of the successive Presidents) to present these awards increased their ownership of the problem. Some male faculty informally objected to them being available only to women but since they were personally funded by me, sanctioning was impossible. Often the attendance by students and faculty members was poor. Embarrassed by this, but doggedly committed I persisted and awarded them for 13 years.

Many years later, I labelled these tactics abductively as provocative misbehaviour i.e. seeking to resist through 'direct action' (Spicer and Böhm, 2007: 1677) by making gender visible (Parsons and Priola, 2013).

Tactic 2: Individualised Managing management

One of the key tasks of feminist activists is framing gender issues in ways that makes them a priority for management. This is particularly important in organizations where power is centralised and where personal relationships are crucial for policy implementation: the context that existed in UL.

As a lecturer and course director, in an invited presentation on women's studies to governing authority in 1996, I compared UL (whose founding president prided himself on having created a secular university) to another Irish university whose mandate was the training of roman catholic priests. Neither had women at full professorial level then (compared with eight per cent at that time in Trinity College Dublin, the oldest and most prestigious Irish university). This led to the founding president contacting me within a week, asking to be briefed on 'the most effective practical steps the university can take within the law to address the matter of recruiting and promoting a greater proportion of females' (O'Connor, 1996:1). I was amazed and delighted and rapidly put together a one-page document, outlining 15 short term actions and five medium term ones. Plans were immediately put in place by the president to implement four of the short-term ones, including gender awareness workshops for senior management (innovatory at that time).

I continued to use this tactic with subsequent presidents: for example, reframing gender in Catholic/Protestant terms in the case of the second President who was from Northern Ireland and understood the world in these terms. I became aware of its effectiveness when during my interview as a possible candidate for the deanship of the faculty, he moved from indicating that I was a 'single issue' candidate (i.e. only concerned with gender inequality) to identifying with me, and appointing me as the first woman faculty dean in UL in 2000.

This tactic remained important when the power of the president was officially consolidated in their right to chair all professorial appointment boards and senior promotional boards. Their contextual commitment to gender equality was reflected in other ‘unusual’ appointments of those who, to varying degrees, might be considered ‘Other’: for example, a woman at lecturer level was appointed by the second president to the newly created post of Dean of Teaching and Learning. Gender representation in the executive committee rose to a third for a short period in the 2000s under the fourth President. This challenged stereotypes. This tactic had limitations (outlined in the concluding section). Much later, as in Bendl and Schmidt’s work (2012), it was labelled *individualised managing management*.

Tactic 3: Perverse alignment on recruitment/ promotion boards and at national level

A pragmatic inclusionary strategy by definition is open to alliances with those who are ideologically opposed, but who share an interest in bringing about change. This is a risky strategy since it suggests ideological assent to opposing value systems.

As a feminist in UL in the 1990s, I was increasingly concerned with what I saw happening in recruitment and promotion contexts. Up to 2,000 I focused on raising awareness of this from outside line management where I was very comfortable. With several other women I was nominated en-bloc by a colleague for the position of dean, which had expectedly become vacant. A woman whom I was supporting for this position was unable to go forward: hence I decided to stand as a voice for change among an initial field of 13 candidates. Following a then challenging process involving nomination, a vision statement, soundings from staff across the university and an interview with the President, I was appointed dean with immediate effect in September 2000. I was

surprised- but daunted only by the need to move office to the ‘power corridor’. As promised in my vision statement, I began to look at the procedures and practices involved in appointments and to insist on the identification of clear criteria for such appointments. I saw this as an attempt to end an era of vague criteria and cronyistic practices. It was also compatible with neoliberalist practices, as reflected in key performance indicators and marking schemas (which became mandatory after 2007). Newman (2013:212) referred to the alignment of employers who wanted to mobilise women as educated, cheap and flexible labour and liberal feminists who were concerned with women’s lack of economic independence as a perverse one. Much later I identified the alliance at an organisational level between feminist and neoliberal agents as a ‘perverse alignment’. It was helpful initially but was open to ‘gaming’ (O’Connor et al., 2017). In male dominated homosocial contexts even apparently objective criteria can be subverted (O’Connor and O’Hagan, 2016; Moss-Racusin et al, 2012; Van Den Brink and Benschop, 2012; Nielsen, 2015).

At national level, there was a tension between the universities’ institutional autonomy and control by the HEA. Having been publicly (and inaccurately) accused of biological essentialism by the CEO of the HEA at the launch of my book on *Management and Gender in Higher Education* in 2014 at the Royal Irish Academy, I was very surprised to be invited by him to be one of the five members of the HEA Expert Group on Gender Equality in Irish Higher Education in 2015. I enthusiastically accepted since it was an opportunity to create change at national level. The fact that it was to be chaired by Máire Geoghegan-Quinn who had been EU commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science 2010-2014 was a further attraction. I recognised that there was a possibility that the HEA might use this opportunity to increase its own control over the universities. In fact, this did not happen until the Task Force Report (HEA, 2018:11). In any case when I was

invited to be a member of the Expert Group, the leadership on gender equality which I saw as essential, was not forthcoming from the universities. Hence strengthening the HEA's control seemed to me to be a risk worth taking, despite its potential for constituting what I later called a potential 'perverse alignment'.

Tactic 4: Resisting Silencing and Gaining Legitimacy

Resisting silencing is a basic issue for feminists within male dominated patriarchal structures. Gaining legitimacy is more problematic and an even greater challenge.

I experienced a number of very public attempts at silencing. In UL, equal opportunity and promotion policies were first developed in the late 1990s, and despite vigorous opposition by Geraldine Sheridan (over 35 meetings of the working party in the latter case), eventually included gender representation. There were no penalties for non-implementation. In 1997, in my probationary year as a full professor, I learned that an all-male recruitment board had been constituted and signed off by the head of department, the dean and the vice president academic and registrar. An attempt to draw this to the attention of governing authority culminated in an invitation to attend a disciplinary hearing, accompanied by a union representative and attended by all of those (men) who had signed off on it. I was frightened and upset. It was difficult to get a union representative to accompany me. A man with whom I had co-authored an article on equal opportunities in Africa in another faculty finally agreed to do so. The meeting proved to be simply an attempt to intimidate, and no sanctions were imposed. I felt huge relief but also anger.

As dean, I experienced a very different kind of attempt at silencing. I had an opportunity once a year to address management committee, which included all line

managers, both academic and non-academic. In November 2002 as part of that process, I presented a table documenting the level of resources received by the various faculties and the gender profile of their staff under the title *Summary Comparison of Colleges by Level of Masculinisation of Faculty and Resource Indicators*. It provoked considerable ire. A motion was proposed and passed that I be prohibited from presenting any cross-faculty data in that forum subsequently. I was angry at this blatant abuse of academic freedom. Since I did not present in that forum again for a year it was possible to ignore the prohibition.

Limited legitimacy for gender equality issues had been achieved through publications and conference presentations (Fleming, 2012) as well as through accessing EU and AP funds (1980s/early 1990s, and late 1990s/ early 2000s respectively). Neoliberalism heightened the valorisation of research funding. Hence the legitimacy of a gender equality agenda was heightened in 2007 by Ita Richardson's success in getting prestigious Science Foundation Ireland research funding for a Gender Audit of Science and Technology; and by our joint efforts in getting an EU Framework 7 action research project (Female Empowerment in Science and Technology in Academia, FESTA, 2012-17). The latter's impact, combined with strong positive (male) leadership in that faculty and an institutional desire to achieve Athena SWAN awards, led to an increase in the proportion of women at full professorial level in STEM from zero in 2012 to 10 per cent in 2016 (close to then EU average of 13 per cent, now 15 per cent: EU, 2019). The downside of this ability to speak the language of the dominant are discussed in the last section.

Tactic 5: Activating latent social movement ties to change national policy

Despite the neoliberal character of UL, in the 1980s and 1990s there were strong ties between women's studies activists in UL, Trinity College Dublin, University College Cork, University College Dublin and National University of Ireland Galway. These were reflected in collaboration around conferences, invited speakers, funding and external examining activities. During the 1992-97 period, as course director in women's studies, I was heavily involved in these activities. They were rooted in a very active tradition of work in women's studies in UL going back to the 1980s and were strengthened in the mid 1990s by solidarity in acquiring (limited) special annual funding from the HEA for women's studies programmes in most universities (O'Connor, 2014b).

These ties between feminist activists and their academic successors persisted in the 2000s albeit largely latent. They were re-activated initially by GENOVATE (an EU funded project at University College Cork) calling a national meeting in Dublin in 2012 to formulate national recommendations for staff gender equality in HE. The meeting reflected and reinforced the idea that, despite the neoliberal pressures fostering competition between us, and although in most universities at this time women's studies had ceased to exist, by supporting each other, we could still be a force to be reckoned with. Thus, when INTEGER (an EU funded project in Trinity College Dublin) proposed the piloting of Athena SWAN in Ireland as a gender equality charter (2015), there was unanimous support. The response to the invitation by FESTA (the EU funded project in UL) to the CEO of the HEA to respond to the priority actions identified by the three projects in 2015 was equally enthusiastic and underlined our ability to work together to achieve change at national level.

As part of the process of consultation by the HEA Expert Group (2015-16) of which I was a member, the stakeholders invited to meet the expert group included these

EU funded projects as well as the Presidents, the unions etc. The HEA, led by Gemma Irvine, provided an able secretariat over the subsequent nine months. The process was exhausting but very satisfying. The increase in the proportion of women at full professorial level in UL over a 15year period (1997-2012) made it possible to consider professorial gender quotas and to link these to state funding. The existence of Athena SWAN driven by INTEGER, made possible the linking of research funding to gender equality. In the wake of the Equality Tribunal Ruling (2014), the report on NUI Galway (Grimson, 2016) by Jane Grimson, with its recommendations as regards gender quotas and the cascade model was very helpful.

It is rare in Ireland that feminists are located in strategic or gatekeeper positions that can be mutually reinforcing as has been documented in FI studies in politics (Chappell, 2002, 2006). Much later this was seen abductively as reflecting the importance of ‘less visible movement processes operating through submerged women’s movement networks in non-social movement organizations’ (Barry et al., 2007: 357) i.e. the mobilization of latent ties to shape gender equality policies at national level.

Discussion and conclusion

The proportion of women at (full) professor level in UL increased from zero in 1997 to 31 per cent in 2016 -far exceeding the national and EU averages. Using an FI perspective, combining it with Correll’s (2017) work on small wins, Meyerson’s and Scully’s (1995) work on ‘tempered radicals’, De Certeau’s (1984) work on strategy and tactics, and nuancing Witz’s (2013) work on inclusionary strategies, this article contributes to an FI analysis of the process of organisational change by identifying and elaborating on the concept of a pragmatic inclusionary strategy and tactics in one

neoliberal HE context. Using an analytic autoethnographic methodology, it focuses on the limits and possibilities of feminist agency in that male dominated masculinist context.

A pragmatic inclusionary strategy is concerned with achieving change within current parameters. Using the opportunities that present is a potentially effective strategy that can be used regardless of the basis for inequality (whether gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality or disability). Lacking infrastructural resources, in its openness to opportunities such a strategy comes close to tactics (De Certeau, 1984). Reflecting on lived experiences, examined in hindsight and using abductive reasoning, the tactics were labelled so as to encourage reflection on the organisational change process.

The nature of tactics is that they are opportunistic responses, so that prioritisation will vary depending on timing and context. *Provocative misbehaviour* (Tactic 1) is very useful in raising gender awareness. However, since being an academic is an organisational profession, it is really only available to those in permanent positions, preferably union members, involving as it does the ultimate possibility of dismissal (Collinson, 2018). *Individualised managing management* (Tactic 2) is useful in moving the agenda forward. Its limitation is that it is successful only when management's objectives are aligned, and where those involved have sufficient power to deliver (e.g. in the case of the president chairing the professorial appointment boards). The failure to initiate gender auditing of training and travel budgets, to introduce sanctions for breaches of procedure/reward compliance; the failure by faculty deans to identify gender targets underlines its limitations in a UL context. Systemic actions such as the linking of university funding by the state to professorial quotas seems more likely to be successful (HEA, 2016): providing as it does an anti-dote to middle management foot-dragging.

Perverse alignment (Tactic 3) and *Resisting Silencing and Gaining Legitimacy* (Tactic 4) both involve speaking the language of the dominant. This is helpful in being understood- but it comes at a price. In the case of the former, a focus on key performance indicators on appointment and promotion boards in UL, was effective for a time in limiting micro-political practices (O'Connor et al, 2017). However, there was a strong possibility of 'gaming' the system, thus reducing or eliminating its potential. *Resisting Silencing and Gaining legitimacy* (Tactic 4) is fundamental since being heard and credible is essential if one wants to be a player. However, buying into a research focused agenda precluded the possibility of a critique of implicitly gendered constructions of success. *Activating latent social movement ties to change national policy* (Tactic 5), was important in moving the issue to a systemic level. As such it was affected by wider political pressures. Thus, political instability within the HEA and the political decision to set up the Task Force (2017-18) delayed the implementation of the recommendations of the Expert Group (HEA, 2016), although both sets of recommendations are now included in the performance compacts between the HEA and the individual universities.

The tactics identified are mostly in a liberal feminist tradition. This is perhaps inevitable since organisations are rarely receptive to radical change, with the ongoing linking of power to masculinity perpetuating a breeding ground for gendered violence. Deliofsky (2010) suggests that (white) women become involved in rituals of exclusion i.e. behaving in ways which solidify their (partial) membership of an elite and thus contribute to reproducing the structures that they are trying to change. This is a possibility. However, it is also possible that tactics may undermine aspects of elite privileging organisationally and nationally.

In my experience, those in senior positions were much more open to arguments concerning the development of the university, whereas those below this level were much

more driven by personal agendas and were the main site of resistance. The frequency with which people, particularly men at the middle levels of the hierarchy, would privately indicate support for various initiatives, but would not do so publicly, was striking. It illustrated the ways through which patriarchy is perpetuated by men's relationships with each other. Women in administrative positions, particularly those in secretarial positions, where compliance is part of the job description, were particularly helpful: generating the feeling of an invisible female web of support in the organisation.

The long-term impact of this strategy and related tactics in UL is questionable. Whereas across the Irish university system, the proportion of women at full professorial level increased by 1-2 per cent per year from 2013-2017, there has been a slight decrease in the proportion of women at that level in UL, with men's 'chance' of accessing a professorship increasing slightly from 2013 on although it declined nationally (O'Connor, 2019). Hate crime has become a particular research focus in the Department of Sociology and Law. At national level, within the HEA after more than a 10 year gap, dedicated structures for gender equality have been created (2014) arguably reflecting an attempt to exert greater control by the HEA over the universities in this area.

Theoretically, the key underlying question is how organisational change comes about, and how this can facilitate the transformation of higher education, or at least bring about gender parity at professorial level. More specifically there is the question of how feminists in increasingly neoliberal and still patriarchal contexts can make a difference to their own work contexts. Further research could usefully be undertaken exploring the extent to which similar or different tactics have been used to create change in other higher educational institutions, particularly focusing on those which have shown the fastest 'pace of change' since 2013 i.e. Trinity College Dublin and Dublin City University (O'Connor, 2019). Equally, the reasons why such tactics have not been used in those universities

which have been laggards, such as NUIGalway could be explored. There are obvious limitations to an analytic autoethnographic methodology and hence it would be useful to use alternative methodologies to explore these issues. The extent to which similar or different tactics have been used to combat other bases of inequality might also be explored. Finally the relevance of a pragmatic inclusionary strategy and tactics could also be looked at in the context of more recent developments i.e. in the context of institutions seeking Athena Swan silver awards and performance compacts between the HEA and individual universities involving the professorial gender quota of 40 per cent by 2024 (HEA, 2016), with funding implications for non-achievement.

This article contributes to the development of an FI theoretical approach to the internal sources of organisational change. By identifying a pragmatic inclusionary strategy for women in one neoliberal male dominated, masculinist context it contributes to understanding gendered organisational change and its limits and possibilities.

References

- Acker, J. (2006), 'Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations', *Gender and Society*, 20 (4): 441-464.
- Acker, J. (1990), 'Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations', *Gender and Society*, 4(2): 139-158.
- Acker, S and Wenger, A. (2019) 'Feminist scholars working around the neoliberal university', *Gender and Education*, 31 (1), pp. 62-81.
- Anderson, L. (2006) 'Analytic Autoethnography', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol 35, No.4, pp373-395.
- Annesley, C. (2010), 'Gender, Politics and Policy Change: The Case of Welfare Reform under New Labour', *Government and Opposition*, 45 (1): 50-72.

- Barnard, S. (2017). 'The Athena SWAN Charter: Promoting Commitment to Gender Equality in Higher Education Institutions'. In White, K. and P. O'Connor (Eds.) *Gendered Success in Higher Education: Global Perspectives*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp.155–174.
- Barry, J., Chandler, J. and Berg, E. (2007), 'Women's movements: abeyant or still on the move?' *Equal Opportunities International* 26(4), pp.352-369.
- By, R.T. (2005), 'Organisational change management: a critical review', *Journal of Change Management*, 54 (4), pp369-380.
- Bendl, R. and Schmidt, A. (2012), 'Revising feminist activism at managerial universities,' *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 31(5/6), pp. 484-505
- Bendl, R., Danowitz, M.A and Schmidt, A. (2014), 'Recalibrating management: Feminist Activism to achieve equality in an evolving university', *British Journal of Management* 25 (2), pp.320-334
- Bourdieu, P. (2001), *Masculine Domination*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.
- Carvalho, T. and Santiago, R. (2010), 'Still academics after all', *Higher Education Policy*, 23 pp. 397-411.
- Chappell, L. (2006), 'Comparing Political Institutions: Revealing the 'Gendered Logic of Appropriateness'', *Politics and Gender* 2 (2): 223-235.
- Chappell, L. (2002), 'The Femocrat Strategy: Expanding the Repertoire of Feminist Activists', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (1), pp 85-98.
- Collinson, D. L. (2018), 'Critical Leadership Studies: Exploring the dialectics of Leadership'. In Riggio, R.E. (Ed.) *What's wrong with leadership? Improving Research and Practice*, Routledge: London, pp. 260-278
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Connell, R.W. (2002). *Gender*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Correll, S.J. (2017), 'Reducing Gender Biases in Modern Workplaces: A small wins approach to organisational change,' *Gender and Society*, 31 (6), pp.725-750.

Deem, R. (1998), 'New managerialism and higher education: The management of performance and cultures in universities in the UK', *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 8(1), pp. 47–70.

Deliovsky, K. (2010), *White Femininity: Race, Gender and Power*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

De Certeau, M. (1984), *The Practice of Everyday Life* Trans S. Randall. Berkley: University of California Press.

Ellis, C. (2004), *The Ethnographic I*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P. (2000), 'Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject'. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edn, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, pp. 733-68.

England, P. (2010), 'The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled', *Gender and Society*, 24 (2): 149-166.

European Commission (2019), *She Figures 2018*. Available at <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

Expert Group Report (HEA 2016), *HEA National Review of Gender Equality in Irish Higher Education Institutions*. hea.ie/sites/default/files/hea_review_of_gender_equality_in_irish_higher_education.pdf

Equality Tribunal. (2014), *Micheline Sheehy Skeffington versus NUI Galway E2014-078*. www.equalitytribunal.ie/en/Cases/2014/November/DEC-E2014-078.html.

Freidenvall, L. and Krook, ML (2011) 'Discursive strategies for institutional reform: Gender Quotas in Sweden and France'. In Krook, M.L. and Mackay, F. (Eds.) *Gender, Politics and Institutions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 42-58.

- Fleming, D. (2012), *The University of Limerick: A History*. Four Courts Press, Dublin.
- Fraser, N. (2008), 'Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World', In Olson, K. (Ed.), *Adding Insult to Injury: Nancy Fraser Debates her Critics*. Verso: London, pp. 273-291.
- Grace, J. (2011), 'Gender and Institutions of Multi-Level Governance: Child Care and Social Policy Debates in Canada', In Krook, M.L. and Mackay, F. (Eds.) *Gender, Politics and Institutions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp.95-111.
- Grimson, J. (2016), *Promoting Excellence through Gender Equality: Final report of the Gender Equality Task Force NUI Galway*.
<https://www.nuigalway.ie/media/equality/files/Final-Report-Gender-Equality-Task-Force-260516.pdf>
- Harford, J. (2018), 'The perspectives of women professors on the professoriate: a missing piece in the narrative of gender equality in the university', *Educ Sci, Gender and Leadership, Special Issue*, Vol 8, no. 2, 50 <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8020050>
- Hearn, J. (2014), 'On men, organisations and intersectionality', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 33 (5), pp. 414-428.
- HEA (2018a), *Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender. July*
<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2018/01/Higher-Education-Institutional-Staff-Profiles-by-Gender-2018.pdf>
- HEA (2018b) *Task Force Report: Accelerating Gender Equality in Irish Higher Educational Institutes: Gender Action Plan 2018-2020*.
<http://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2018/11/Gender-Equality-Taskforce-Action-Plan-2018-2020.pdf>
- Jordan, B. and Richardson, I. (2001), Programme of positive action supporting the career development of women faculty and staff. Unpublished document.
- Kenney, S.J. (1996), 'New Research on gendered political institutions', *Political Research Quarterly*, 49 (2):445-466.

Laursen, S.L. and De Welde, K. (2019), 'The changer and the changed: evolving theories and practices of change in ADVANCE calls for institutional transformation', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 38 (2): 140-159.

Liu, H. and Pechenkina, E. (2016), 'Staying quiet or rocking the boat? An autoethnography of organisational visual white supremacy', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 35 (3): 186-204.

Lynch, K. Grummell, B. and Devine, D. (2012), *New Managerialism in Education: Commercialisation, Carelessness and Gender*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mackay, F. and Murtagh, C. (2019), 'New institutions, New Gender Rules? A Feminist Institutional Lens on Women and Power Sharing'. *Feminists@law* 9 (1) <https://journals.kent.ac.uk/index.php/feministsatlaw/article/view/745->

Mackay, F. (2011), "Conclusion: Towards a Feminist Institutionalism". In Krook, M.L. and Mackay, F. (Eds.) *Gender, Politics and Institutions*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 81-196.

Mackay, F, Kenny, M. and Chappell, L. (2010), "New Institutionalism Through a Gender Lens: Towards a Feminist Institutionalism," *International Political Science Review*, 31 (5): 573–588.

Meyerson, D.E and Scully, M.A (1995), 'Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change', *Organisation Science* 6 (5), pp. 585-600.

MIT (1999), 'President Charles M Vest: Introductory Remarks', *The MIT faculty Newsletter*, Vol X1 (4), March <http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.html>

Moss-Racusin, C. Dovidio, J.F, Brescoli, V.L. Graham, M.J. and Handelsman, J. (2012), 'Science faculty's subtle gender biases favour male students'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (41), pp. 16474-16479

Newman, J. (2013), 'Spaces of power: Feminism, neoliberalism and gendered labour', *Social Politics* 20(2), pp.200-221.

Nielsen, M. (2015), 'Limits to meritocracy? Gender in academic recruitment and promotion processes', *Science and Public Policy* 43(3) pp.386–99.

O'Connor, P. (1996) Briefing Doc for President. Unpublished doc. Nov 20th, pp1-5

O'Connor, P. (1999/98) *Emerging Voices: Women in Contemporary Irish Society*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

O'Connor, P. (2008) *Irish Children and Teenagers in a Changing World*. Manchester: MUP

O'Connor, P. (2014a) *Management and Gender in Higher Education*. Manchester University Press

O'Connor, P. (2014b); 'Understanding success: A Case Study of Gendered Change in the Professoriate' *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36(2): 212-224.

O'Connor, P. (2017) 'Towards a new gender agenda and a model for change.' In K. White and P. O'Connor (eds). *Gendered Success in Higher Education: Global Perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan: 255-282.

O'Connor, P. and O'Hagan, C. (2016) 'Excellence in university academic staff evaluation: a problematic reality?' *Studies in Higher Education* 41 (11) 1943-1957.

O'Connor, P. et al., al., (2017) Micro-political practices in higher education: a challenge to excellence as a rationalising myth? *Critical Studies in Education* DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2017.1381629.

O'Connor, P. (2019) 'Creating gendered change in the Irish Higher Educational system: is senior leadership up to the task? Unpublished ms

OECD (2012), *Closing the Gender Gap: Act Now!* www.oecd.org/gender/closingthe-gap.htm

Parsons, E. and Priola, V. (2012), 'Agents for Change and Changed Agents: The Micropolitics of Change and Feminism in the Academy', *Gender, Work and Organization* 20 (5), pp.580-598.

Quinlivan, S. (2017), 'Disrupting the Status Quo? Discrimination in Academic Promotions' *Irish Employment Law Journal*, 14 (3), pp. 68-75.

Sang, K.J.C. Joy, S., King, J. Sayce, S. (2012), 'Being a feminist academic', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 31 (5/6) <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.ul.ie/10.1108/edi.2012.03031eaa.001>

Spicer, A. and Böhm, S. (2007), 'Moving management: theorizing struggles against the hegemony of management', *Organization studies* 28(11), pp.1667-1698.

Styhre, A. and Tienari, J. (2013), 'Self-reflexivity scrutinized: (pro)feminist men learning that gender matters', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, An International Journal*, 32 (2):195-210.

THE (2018), *World University Rankings* <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2018/world>

Thorn, R. (2017), '*Independent Review of Certain Matters and Allegations relating to the University of Limerick*', www.heai.ie

Universities Act: Ireland (1997), Government Publications, Dublin.

Van Den Brink, M. (2015), 'The politics of knowledge: the responses to feminist research from academic leaders', *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 34(6), pp. 483-495.

Van Den Brink, M. and Benschop, Y. (2012), 'Gender practices in the construction of academic excellence: Sheep with five legs', *Organization* 19(4), pp. 507-524.

Verge, T., Ferrer-Fons, M. and Gonzalez, M.J. (2018), 'Resistance to mainstreaming gender into the higher education curriculum', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 25 (1): 86-101.

Walby, S. (2009), *Globalization and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities*, Sage, London.

Walby, S. (2011), *The Future of Feminism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Walsh, E. and Fagan, K. (2011), *Friends, Foes and Founding a University*, Collins Press, Cork.

West, C., and Zimmerman, D. H. (1987), 'Doing Gender', *Gender and Society*, 1(2), pp. 125-151.

Witz, A. (2002), 'Patriarchy and the professions. The gendered politics of occupational closure'. In Jackson, S. and Scott, S. (Eds) *Gender: A Sociological Reader*, Psychology Press, London pp122-133.

Witz, A. (2013/1992), *Professions and patriarchy*. Routledge, London.

Yassour-Borochowitz, D. (2012), "Only if she is sexy": An autoethnography of female researcher-male participants relations, *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 31 (5), 402-417.
